

2007 ITIB Project Selection and Ranking Criteria for Major IT Projects

| Criteria | Pts. | Score | ***Weighted Score Factor | Tie Breakers Priority |
|---|-----------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Strategic Alignment | | | | |
| Does the project support Commonwealth Strategic Plan for Technology initiatives? | 5 | 5 pts. if the project supports at least one strategic initiative | Agency score times 4 | |
| Does the project support one of the Council on Virginia's Future 8 long term objectives | 8 | > 6 objectives - 8 pts. 4 to 6 objectives – 6 pts. 1 to 3 objectives – 3 pts. No – 0 pts. | Agency score times 4 | 2 |
| Is this project mission critical to the agency? | 2 | Yes – 2 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| Did the agency use the Enterprise Business Architecture or other methods to find agencies that have solutions that already exist or to find agencies that have a common need? | 2 | High – 2 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| Does the project support one of the Governor's Enterprise initiatives being sponsored and managed by the Enterprise Solutions Group? | 9 | Yes – 9 pts. No – 0 pts. | Agency score times 4 | 1 |
| Does the project support at least one of the agency service areas identified as most critical in the Governor's Performance Goals? | 4 | Yes – 4 pts. No – 0 pts. | Agency score times 4 | 3 |
| Maximum Pts. | 30 | | 108 | |
| 2. Technical Feasibility | | | | |
| Is a proposed technical approach stated? | 3 | Yes – 3 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| Does the proposed approach comply with the Commonwealth enterprise technical architecture? | 2 | Yes – 2 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| Maximum Pts. | 5 | | 5 | |

2007 ITIB Project Selection and Ranking Criteria for Major IT Projects

| Criteria | Pts. | Score | ***Weighted Score Factor | Tie Breakers Priority |
|---|-----------|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 3. Benefits to the Commonwealth | | | | |
| Does the project benefit chronically underserved stakeholders? | 3 | Yes, > 1 stakeholder – 3ps. Yes, 1 stakeholder – 2 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| Will the project increase public protection, health, education, environment, or safety, improve customer service, or increase citizen access to services? | 5 | Yes, > 1 priority – 5 pts. Yes, 1 priority – 3 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| Will the project transform the way the agency does business? | 5 | Yes – 5 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| Does this project benefit other agencies within the Secretariat, other agencies outside the Secretariat, all agencies, or local governments? | 10 | Yes, benefits all 4 groups – 10 pts. Yes, benefits 3 groups – 8 pts. Yes, benefits 2 groups – 6 pts. Yes, benefits 1 group – 4 pts. No – 0 pts. | Agency score times 4 | 5 |
| Does the project support legal or regulatory requirements? | 7 | Yes – 7 pts. No – 0 pts. | Agency score times 4 | 4 |
| Maximum Pts. | 30 | | 81 | |
| 4. Risk | | | | |
| What is the project cost risk? | 5 | Under \$5m –5 pts. From \$5-10m – 3 pts. From \$10-20m –2 pts. Greater than 20m – 1 pt. | Agency score times 2 | |
| What is the project complexity risk? | 2 | Low – 2 pts. Medium – 1 pt. High – 0 pts. | Agency score times 2 | |
| What is the project risk assessment? | 2 | Low – 2 pts. Medium – 1 pt. High – 0 pts. | Agency score times 2 | 6 |
| Does the project have a clearly defined business owner? | 2 | Yes – 2 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |

2007 ITIB Project Selection and Ranking Criteria for Major IT Projects

| Criteria | Pts. | Score | ***Weighted Score Factor | Tie Breakers Priority |
|---|-----------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Does the project have a clearly defined project sponsor? | 2 | Yes – 2 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| Does the project have a clearly defined scope? | 2 | Yes – 2 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| Maximum Pts. | 15 | | 24 | |
| 5.Funding Requirements | | | | |
| What is the confidence level in the accuracy of the initial project estimated cost at completion? | 2 | Low – 0 pt. Medium – 1 pt. High – 2 pts. | | |
| Did the agency describe a valid method to determine the estimate cost at completion? | 2 | Yes – 2 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| Have tangible types of benefits been identified? | 4 | Yes – 4 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| Have intangible types of benefits been identified? | 2 | Yes – 2 pts. No – 0 pts. | | |
| What percent of the project funding is from Non-state funds? | 3 | 80 - 100% Non-state Funded – 3 pts. 50 – 79% Non-state Funded – 2 pts. 1 – 49% Non-state Funded – 1 pt. | | |
| What is the project funding risk? | 2 | Low – 2 pts. Medium – 1 pt. High – 0 pts. | | |
| Maximum Pts. | 15 | | 15 | |
| 6. Past Performance by Agency | | | | |
| What is the overall rating average of all projects listed on the Dashboard for the agency? | 3 | If lowest overall rating average for any three consecutive months in the last year is: Green - 3 pts. Yellow - 1 pt. | | |

2007 ITIB Project Selection and Ranking Criteria for Major IT Projects

| | | | | |
|---|------------|---|------------|--|
| | | Red - 0 pts. | | |
| If the project is listed on the Dashboard, what is the overall rating for the last three months reported? | 2 | If overall project rating for the last three months reported is Green - 3 pts. Yellow - 1 pt. Red - 0 pts. | | |
| Maximum Pts. | 5 | | 5 | |
| Total Pts. Possible for base score | 100 | Maximum weighted score = | 257 | |

TIE BREAKER PROCESS – When 2 or more projects have the same initial weighted score, use the project assigned pts. for those criteria with assigned “Tie Breaker Priority” numbers in priority order.

Evaluate one priority criteria at a time for all tied projects:

- ❑ 1 point will be added to the weighted score of the project(s) with the highest score
- ❑ After evaluating priority criteria, if more than one project is still tied with the same weighted score proceed to the next priority criteria and repeat the process until the tie is broken.

Note: The tiebreaker process only used to determine PMD priority among those projects with the same initial weighted scores.

WEIGHTED CATEGORIES

*****Weighted Score Factor: Based on last year’s priorities as set by the ITIB.**

The most heavily weighted category is the ‘Strategic Alignment’ category with a factor of 4. This increases the maximum point’s score to 108. This category was selected because it most closely aligns with the ITIB’s decision to evaluate major projects against the strategic vision established for the Commonwealth of Virginia by the Council on Virginia’s Future, the Governor of Virginia, the General Assembly, the ITIB, and the Enterprise Business Architecture.

2007 ITIB Project Selection and Ranking Criteria for Major IT Projects

The second weighted category that supports this ITIB decision is the ‘Benefits to the Commonwealth’ category. This was weighted with a factor of 4 which increases the weighted score factor to 81.

The third weighted category selected is ‘Project Risk’. This was weighted with a factor of 2, which increases the possible maximum weighted score to 32. This adds emphasis to the successful implementation and outcomes of the project.

TIE BREAKING PROCESS

The CATSPA system breaks PMD weighted score ties with the following process:

1. Multiply the PMD weighted score by 100
2. Using the “Tie Breakers Priority” for each question, points are added to the PMD weighted score.
For example: Two projects have a PMD weighted score of 16000. For the question “Does this project have the potential to benefit ...” the project with the higher question score will get additional points added to the weighted score. The first “Tie Breaker Priority” will add an additional 7 points to the PMD weighted score. Each subsequent “Tie Breaker Priority” will get one less point added.
3. If the tie breaking process does not break ties; the original evaluation score is used to break ties.